

Tests of Lorentz Symmetry with Penning Traps and Antihydrogen ¹

Neil Russell

Physics Department, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI 49855, USA

Abstract. Possibilities for testing Lorentz symmetry using precision experiments with antiprotons in Penning traps and with antihydrogen spectroscopy are reviewed. Estimates of bounds on relevant coefficients for Lorentz violation in the Standard-Model Extension (SME) are considered.

THE STANDARD-MODEL EXTENSION

Einstein's General Relativity and the Standard Model of particle physics provide an excellent description of nature. They are expected to merge into a single theory at energies near the Planck scale of 10^{19} GeV. Experiments cannot access these energies, but one can at least hope to see suppressed effects of Planck-scale physics in suitable high-precision experiments. One possible signal of an underlying unified quantum gravity theory is the violation of Lorentz symmetry. In this proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Low-Energy Antiproton Physics (LEAP 05), some possibilities for detecting Lorentz and CPT violation in experiments with low-energy antiprotons will be reviewed. Most of the results summarized here are presented in more detail in the published literature, and a few speculative ideas are discussed.

Any effects of Lorentz violation can be described using effective field theory [1]. To be realistic, both General Relativity and the Standard Model must be included together with coordinate-independent Lorentz violation. These components make up the effective field theory called the Standard-Model Extension (SME). It provides a general description of all possible realistic Lorentz violations in nature. The Minkowski limit of this theory has been studied for more than a decade [2, 3], and recent work [4] has clarified the key ideas in curved spacetime. Among the underlying ideas are string-theory concepts and various types of symmetry breaking [5]. For some other perspectives on Lorentz violation presented at LEAP '05, see [6].

The focus in this article is primarily on theoretical and experimental studies of Lorentz tests investigating the SME with Penning traps [7, 8, 9] and with spectroscopy of hydrogen (H) and antihydrogen ($\bar{H}$) [10, 11]. A wide range of recent results investigating the SME exists and continues to grow. This includes studies of neutrinos [12], electromagnetism [13, 14], electromagnetic cavities [15], clock-comparison experiments [16],

¹ Proceedings for invited talk at Eighth International Conference on Low Energy Antiproton Physics (LEAP '05), Bonn, Germany, 16-22 May 2005.

satellites [17], hydrogen molecules [18], neutral-meson oscillations [19], muons [20], baryogenesis [21], the torsion pendulum [22], spacetime varying couplings [23], the Higgs sector [24], and noncommutative coordinates [25].

PENNING TRAPS

In general, Penning traps employ a strong uniform magnetic field to confine charged particles within a region close to a central symmetry axis. Particles with one sign of charge are prevented from drifting in the B -field direction by an electric field with a quadrupole component. The Penning trap is capable of trapping a single particle for periods of several months and can be used to make high-precision measurements of oscillation frequencies of the particle. The absolute frequency resolutions of Penning traps make them excellent devices for testing Lorentz symmetry. In the case of electrons, Lorentz tests have been performed based on frequency resolutions of a few Hertz [8]. Planned experiments with protons and antiprotons should improve the precision of measurements of the gyromagnetic ratios of both particles [9].

Since Lorentz-violating effects are minuscule, they can be calculated in the framework of conventional perturbation theory. It turns out that the energy levels of the trap are dominated by the magnetic field, so one way to calculate the effects of Lorentz violation on the energy levels is to use the relativistic Landau levels of the particle in the uniform B field as the unperturbed wave functions for the first-order energy corrections. For our calculations, we take a magnetic field aligned with the z axis, choose the gauge $A^\mu = (0, -yB, 0, 0)$, and denote the stationary states with principal quantum number n and spin s by $\chi_{n,s}^p$ for protons, and by $\chi_{n,s}^{\bar{p}}$ for antiprotons.

The SME provides coefficients that account for possible Lorentz violations in each flavor of fundamental particle. Some difficulties in treating the constituent quarks and antiquarks of the proton and antiproton can be overcome by treating protons and antiprotons themselves as fundamental. Thus, effective parameters a_μ^p , b_μ^p , $H_{\mu\nu}^p$, $c_{\mu\nu}^p$, $d_{\mu\nu}^p$ are used. In the framework of relativistic quantum mechanics, the perturbation hamiltonian for a proton is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{pert}}^p = & a_\mu^p \gamma^0 \gamma^\mu - b_\mu^p \gamma_5 \gamma^0 \gamma^\mu - c_{00}^p m \gamma^0 - i(c_{0j}^p + c_{j0}^p) D^j + i(c_{00}^p D_j - c_{jk}^p D^k) \gamma^0 \gamma^j \\ & - d_{j0}^p m \gamma_5 \gamma^j + i(d_{0j}^p + d_{j0}^p) D^j \gamma_5 + i(d_{00}^p D_j - d_{jk}^p D^k) \gamma^0 \gamma_5 \gamma^j + \frac{1}{2} H_{\mu\nu}^p \gamma^0 \sigma^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Certain coefficients for Lorentz violation can be eliminated by field redefinitions [26]. For the antiproton, the perturbation hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{pert}}^{\bar{p}}$ differs in several negative signs that appear in the charge-conjugation process. Thus, the corrections to the Landau energy levels are found from

$$\delta E_{n,s}^p = \int \chi_{n,s}^{p\dagger} \hat{H}_{\text{pert}}^p \chi_{n,s}^p d^3r \quad , \quad \delta E_{n,s}^{\bar{p}} = \int \chi_{n,s}^{\bar{p}\dagger} \hat{H}_{\text{pert}}^{\bar{p}} \chi_{n,s}^{\bar{p}} d^3r \quad . \quad (2)$$

The leading-order corrections to the proton energy levels are

$$\delta E_{n,\pm 1}^p \approx a_0^p \mp b_3^p - c_{00}^p m_p \pm d_{30}^p m_p \pm H_{12}^p$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2}(c_{00}^p + c_{11}^p + c_{22}^p)(2n+1 \mp 1)\omega_c \\
& - \left(\frac{1}{2}c_{00}^p + c_{33}^p \mp d_{03}^p \mp d_{30}^p\right) \frac{p_z^2}{m_p} \quad , \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

and these produce shifts in the measured trap frequencies.

One of these frequencies is the cyclotron frequency, defined in the unperturbed case by

$$\omega_c = E_{1,+1}^p - E_{0,+1}^p \quad , \quad (4)$$

where $E_{n,s}^p$ are the unperturbed energies of the proton. Another is the Larmor frequency, defined by

$$\omega_L = E_{0,-1}^p - E_{0,+1}^p \quad . \quad (5)$$

Using equation (3), and the corresponding antiproton energy shifts, the frequencies as perturbed by Lorentz violation are

$$\omega_c^p = \omega_c^{\bar{p}} \approx (1 - c_{00}^p - c_{11}^p - c_{22}^p)\omega_c \quad , \quad (6)$$

$$\omega_L^p \approx \omega_L + 2b_3^p - 2d_{30}^p m_p - 2H_{12}^p \quad , \quad (7)$$

$$\omega_L^{\bar{p}} \approx \omega_L - 2b_3^p - 2d_{30}^p m_p - 2H_{12}^p \quad , \quad (8)$$

at leading order.

In the expressions above, the subscripts on the coefficients of Lorentz violation refer to coordinates fixed in the laboratory reference frame. As an experiment runs over a period of months, the laboratory rotates relative to the fixed background stars. It also moves at about 8 kilometers per second around the center of the Earth and at about 30 kilometers per second around the Sun. The SME coefficients for Lorentz violation are fixed in the Sun-based standard inertial reference frame that has been adopted for tests of the SME, whereas the measured laboratory observables are time dependent. For any Earth-fixed laboratory, this dependence includes the sidereal period of just under 24 hours. In principle, other periods can be introduced by rotating turntables as has been done for example in some cavity experiments [15].

To compare results from different experiments it is useful to express the bounds in the standard inertial-frame coordinates (T, X, Y, Z) . The transformations between the laboratory frame coordinates (t, x, y, z) and the inertial ones are discussed in Appendix C of Reference [13].

Experimental detection of Lorentz violation in this type of experiment involves the comparison of two frequencies, and can be put into two broad categories: *sidereal* and *instantaneous*.

Sidereal tests look for time dependence in one frequency by comparing it with a stable frequency reference. This could be done, for example, with a trapped proton by subtracting from the Larmor frequency ω_L^p a fixed reference frequency. In general, even the reference frequency will be affected by the coefficients for Lorentz violation, as is known from studies of the SME effects on atomic clocks [16], masers [11], and microwave cavities [15]. Therefore, the reference clock must be differently affected by the SME background. In a sidereal test monitoring the Larmor frequency, the dependence on the magnetic field is likely to be a dominant limitation on the precision. One way

to handle this is to use the cyclotron frequency ω_c^p as the reference clock, since it has the same fractional B -field dependence as the Larmor frequency. The different SME-coefficient dependence of the two frequencies could provide a feasible test of Lorentz violation without suppression. For example, one could monitor the difference

$$\omega_L^p - \frac{g}{2}\omega_c^p \approx 2b_3^p - 2d_{30}^p m_p - 2H_{12}^p \quad , \quad (9)$$

which would be zero in the absence of Lorentz violation, but which is sensitive at leading order to the quantity $\tilde{b}_3 = b_3^p - d_{30}^p m_p - H_{12}^p$. If this signal showed no Fourier component at the sidereal frequency and fell within a one-Hertz error bar then $\tilde{b}_3$ would be bounded at the level of 10^{-25} GeV. If a sidereal test was done with a single trapped antiproton, a similar bound could be envisaged by monitoring the difference

$$\omega_L^{\bar{p}} - \frac{g}{2}\omega_c^{\bar{p}} \approx -2b_3^p - 2d_{30}^p m_p - 2H_{12}^p \quad , \quad (10)$$

thereby measuring a combination of parameters with opposite sign for b_3^p .

Instantaneous tests involve the comparison of two frequencies measured at effectively the same time, so that orientational issues are minimized. For example, if the Larmor frequency for a single trapped proton and a single trapped antiproton in the same magnetic field could be measured simultaneously, then the difference in these quantities

$$\omega_L^p - \omega_L^{\bar{p}} \approx 4b_3^p \quad , \quad (11)$$

would be a measure of Lorentz violation. The advantage of this type of test is the access it gives to cleaner bounds: instead of bounding a combination of coefficients, it isolates a single component b_3^p . This quantity is still time-dependent because the bound is on the component of b_j^p in the direction of the magnetic field, which rotates relative to the solar-based inertial reference frame. Access to such clean bounds is possible only in the relatively small number of experiments that compare particles and antiparticles. For example, atomic-clock tests cannot do this type of instantaneous test since this would require antiatom-based clocks. One could envisage this test performed with two traps held within the same magnetic field. Even with one trap, it should be possible to do an instantaneous test, since the orientational information could be accounted for by time-binning the experimental data. A major limitation would then be the magnetic-field stability, although this could perhaps be handled by making the comparison between the quantities in equations (9) and (10), rather than between the two Larmor frequencies.

HYDROGEN AND ANTIHYDROGEN

Several tests of Lorentz symmetry based on high-precision spectroscopy have been done [11]. With the addition of antihydrogen spectroscopy in the future, it would be possible to perform new tests of Lorentz and CPT symmetry. A preliminary analysis of the range of possible Lorentz-violating effects has been completed [10], and in this section some of those results are reviewed. The status of current efforts to trap antihydrogen atoms

is discussed elsewhere in this conference proceedings. The discussion below considers spectroscopy with trapped antihydrogen, based on quantum-mechanical stationary states modified by the presence of a uniform magnetic field. An analysis of transition frequencies of free H and $\bar{H}$ has been done elsewhere and shows no leading-order effects [10].

The effects of Lorentz violation on H and $\bar{H}$ can be calculated at leading order using the relativistic solutions of the Dirac equation for free H and $\bar{H}$ as the unperturbed states. In the case of H , the perturbation hamiltonian for the electron is of the same form as equation (1) but with the superscripts p replaced by e . The Lorentz-violating effects involving the proton can also be included without difficulty. There are four possible spin configurations for each state in the decoupled basis, determined by the choice of component of angular momentum along the quantization axis, $m_J = \pm 1/2$ and $m_I = \pm 1/2$, where J and I are the electron and proton angular momenta. The shifts in the energy levels are found to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E^H(m_J, m_I) \approx & (a_0^e + a_0^p - c_{00}^e m_e - c_{00}^p m_p) \\ & + (-b_3^e + d_{30}^e m_e + H_{12}^e) m_J / |m_J| \\ & + (-b_3^p + d_{30}^p m_p + H_{12}^p) m_I / |m_I| \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For trapped H and $\bar{H}$, we assume a uniform magnetic field B that splits the 1S and 2S levels into four hyperfine Zeeman levels, denoted in order of increasing energy by $|a\rangle_n$, $|b\rangle_n$, $|c\rangle_n$, $|d\rangle_n$, with principal quantum number $n = 1$ or 2 , for both H and $\bar{H}$. The $|c\rangle$ and $|d\rangle$ states are trapped and so it is of interest to consider transitions involving these states. The shifts in energies of the states $|d\rangle_1$ and $|d\rangle_2$ are identical, so no leading-order effect on this particular 1S-2S transition is seen for either H or $\bar{H}$.

In the case of the 1S-2S transition between the states $|c\rangle_1$ and $|c\rangle_2$ in H and $\bar{H}$, an unsuppressed frequency shift does occur. This is because the dependence on n in the hyperfine splitting produces a spin-mixing difference between the 1S and 2S levels. The effect can be shown to be optimum at a magnetic field of about $B \simeq 0.01$ Tesla for both H and $\bar{H}$. The magnetic field gradient of the trap may be a limitation in this case.

The hyperfine transitions within a single energy level are also of interest for Lorentz tests in H and $\bar{H}$. It is found that the coefficients for Lorentz violation give rise to field-dependent energy shifts of the $|a\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$ states and field-independent shifts of the $|b\rangle$ and $|d\rangle$ states. In the case of the $|d\rangle_1 \rightarrow |c\rangle_1$ transition, a field-independent point exists at about 0.65 Tesla, which may be useful experimentally. At this field value, the transition is essentially a proton spin flip and so the coefficients for Lorentz violation that are bounded are those of protons. The relevant leading-order shifts in the frequencies $\nu_{c \rightarrow d}^H$ and $\nu_{c \rightarrow d}^{\bar{H}}$ for H and $\bar{H}$ respectively are:

$$\delta \nu_{c \rightarrow d}^H \approx (-b_3^p + d_{30}^p m_p + H_{12}^p) / \pi \quad , \quad (13)$$

$$\delta \nu_{c \rightarrow d}^{\bar{H}} \approx (b_3^p + d_{30}^p m_p + H_{12}^p) / \pi \quad . \quad (14)$$

Expressions (13) and (14) are similar to the expressions (7) and (8) discussed for the Penning trap and this is because both involve the spin-flip transition of a proton in a magnetic field.

Sidereal tests looking for Lorentz violation in conventional H have already been conducted [11] at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, based on the $F = 1$,

$\Delta m_F = \pm 1$ transition. Since a weak field was used, the bound is on a mixture of electron and proton parameters of the form seen in equation (13). A frequency stability of about one mHz gives an upper bound at the level of about 10^{-27} GeV. Sidereal tests with $\overline{H}$ are not yet possible, but in principle could be done by monitoring the hyperfine transition and comparing it to a stable clock. The bound would be on the Lorentz-violation combination seen in equation (14).

Instantaneous tests comparing the hyperfine transitions in H and $\overline{H}$ would bound the difference between the two quantities in (13) and (14):

$$\Delta v_{c \rightarrow d} \equiv v_{c \rightarrow d}^H - v_{c \rightarrow d}^{\overline{H}} \approx -2b_3^p/\pi \quad . \quad (15)$$

The advantage of this type of test is the clean bound obtained on just one coefficient for Lorentz violation. A non-zero value of b_3^p would indicate CPT violation, whereas the combination of coefficients appearing would only indicate Lorentz violation. If a 10-mHz resolution was obtained the bound would be at the level of 10^{-26} GeV.

DISCUSSION

The sensitivity of the Lorentz tests discussed here is determined by absolute frequency resolutions δv and not by the relative precisions $\delta v/v$. To optimize such tests one may be able to select experimental variables so as to improve the absolute resolution, even when this seems counterintuitive since no gain appears in relative precision. In the case of the Penning trap, if the magnetic field could be reduced by a factor of 10, without reduction in the relative precision, the bound on the SME coefficients would improve tenfold because of the reduction in the Larmor frequency.

The SME is a useful tool for seeking promising tests of Lorentz violation. One significant feature is the ability to compare results of Lorentz tests in different experiments. In particular, the Penning trap experiments with protons and antiprotons, and spectroscopy experiments with H and with $\overline{H}$ have a significant area of overlap. However, since the coefficients for Lorentz violation are those for protons and electrons only, there is no overlap with CPT tests with kaons, for example. The SME also provides a means of identifying unsuppressed transitions. For example, in the case of free H and $\overline{H}$, effects in the 1S-2S transition are suppressed by two powers of the fine-structure constant.

It is also worth noting that most of the Penning-trap discussion for protons and antiprotons holds also for similar experiments with electrons and positrons, using the anomaly frequency in place of the Larmor frequency. Bounds from several such experiments exist [8], based on experimental data taken more than twenty years ago and could possibly be improved with present technology.

REFERENCES

1. V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, *Phys. Rev.* **D 51**, 3923 (1995).
2. D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev.* **D 55**, 6760 (1997); *Phys. Rev.* **D 58**, 116002 (1998).
3. For an overview of recent work, see *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry III*, edited by V.A. Kostelecký, World Scientific, Singapore (2005).

4. V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 105009 (2004); R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 065008 (2005); V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* in press (2005), (gr-qc/0510124).
5. V. A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, *Phys. Rev. D* **39**, 683 (1989); *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1886 (1989); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 224 (1989); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1811 (1991); V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, *Nucl. Phys. B* **359**, 545 (1991); *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 046007 (2001); *Phys. Lett. B* **381**, 89 (1996); V. A. Kostelecký, M. Perry and R. Potting, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4541 (2000).
6. N. E. Mavromatos, hep-ph/0506294.
7. R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecký, N. Russell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** 1432 (1997); *Phys. Rev. D* **57** 3932 (1998).
8. R.K. Mittleman, I.I. Ioannou, H.G. Dehmelt, and N. Russell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 2116 (1999); H. Dehmelt, R. Mittleman, R.S. Van Dyck, Jr., and P. Schwinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 4694 (1999); G. Gabrielse, A. Khabbaz, D. S. Hall, C. Heimann, H. Kalinowsky and W. Jhe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3198 (1999).
9. W. Quint *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. B* **214**, 207 (2004).
10. R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecký, N. Russell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2254 (1999); G. M. Shore, *Nucl. Phys. B* **717**, 86 (2005).
11. D.F. Phillips, M.A. Humphrey, E.M. Mattison, R.E. Stoner, R.F.C. Vessot, R.L. Walsworth, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 111101 (2001); *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 063807 (2003).
12. L. B. Auerbach *et al.* [LSND Collaboration], hep-ex/0506067; V. A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 031902 (2004); *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 016005 (2004); *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 076002 (2004).
13. V.A. Kostelecký, M. Mewes, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 056005 (2002).
14. V.A. Kostelecký, M. Mewes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 251304 (2001); R. Jackiw and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3572 (1999); V. A. Kostelecký, C. D. Lane and A. G. M. Pickering, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 056006 (2002); Q. G. Bailey and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 076006 (2004); R. Lehnert and R. Potting, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 125010 (2004) [Erratum-ibid. *D* **70**, 129906 (2004)]; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 110402 (2004); F. R. Klinkhamer and C. Rupp, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 045020 (2004); T. Jacobson, S. Liberati and D. Mattingly, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 124011 (2003); G. M. Shore, *Contemp. Phys.* **44**, 503 (2003); H. Belich, T. Costa-Soares, M.M. Ferreira and J.A. Helayel-Neto, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **42**, 127 (2005); D. Colladay and P. McDonald, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 125007 (2004); B. Altschul, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 056005 (2004); B. Altschul and D. Colladay, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 125015 (2005); C. Lämmerzahl, A. Macias and H. Mueller, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 025007 (2005); D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Lett. B* **511**, 209 (2001); V. A. Kostelecký and A. G. M. Pickering, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 031801 (2003); B. Altschul and V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Lett. B* **628**, 106 (2005).
15. M. E. Tobar, P. L. Stanwix, M. Susli, P. Wolf, C. R. Locke and E. N. Ivanov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 040404 (2005); P. L. Stanwix *et al.*, hep-ph/0506074, to appear in *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (2005); P. Antonini, M. Okhapkin, E. Goklu and S. Schiller, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 050101 (2005); P. Wolf, S. Bize, A. Clairon, G. Santarelli, M. E. Tobar and A. N. Luiten, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 051902 (2004); P. Wolf, M. E. Tobar, S. Bize, A. Clairon, A. N. Luiten and G. Santarelli, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **36**, 2352 (2004); H. Müller, S. Herrmann, C. Braxmaier, S. Schiller, A. Peters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 020401 (2003); H. Müller, S. Herrmann, A. Saenz, A. Peters and C. Lämmerzahl, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 116006 (2003); H. Müller, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 045004 (2005); J. A. Lipa, J. A. Nissen, S. Wang, D. A. Stricker and D. Avaloff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 060403 (2003).
16. V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 116010 (1999); *J. Math. Phys.* **40**, 6245 (1999); D. Bear, R. E. Stoner, R. L. Walsworth, V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5038 (2000) [Erratum-ibid. **89**, 209902 (2002)]; F. Cane *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 230801 (2004); P. Wolf, S. Bize, M. E. Tobar, F. Chapelet, A. Clairon, A. N. Luiten and G. Santarelli, physics/0506168; R. L. Walsworth, D. Bear, M. Humphrey, E. M. Mattison, D. F. Phillips, R. E. Stoner and R. F. C. Vessot, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **539**, 119 (2000); L. Hunter, in *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry*, V.A. Kostelecký, Ed., World Scientific, Singapore (1999), page 180.
17. R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecký, C. D. Lane and N. Russell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 090801 (2002); *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 125008 (2003); C. Lämmerzahl *et al.*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **36**, 615 (2004).
18. H. Müller, S. Herrmann, A. Saenz, A. Peters and C. Lämmerzahl, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 076004 (2004).
19. D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Lett. B* **344**, 259 (1995); *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 6224 (1995); V. A. Kostelecký and R. Van Kooten, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 5585 (1996); V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1818 (1998); *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 016002 (2000); V. A. Kostelecký and A. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 096002 (2001); N. Isgur, V. A. Kostelecký and A. P. Szczepaniak, *Phys. Lett. B* **515**, 333 (2001); H. Nguyen, hep-ex/0112046; Y. B. Hsiung [KTeV Collaboration], *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **86**, 312

- (2000); J. M. Link *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B 556**, 7 (2003); R. W. Gardner, hep-ex/0112040; B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 142002 (2004); B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], SLAC-PUB 9696 (2003), hep-ex/0303043; K. Abe *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3228 (2001); K. Ackerstaff *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], *Z. Phys.* **C 76**, 401 (1997); M. Feindt, C. Kreuter, and O. Podobrin, DELPHI 97-98, CONF 80 (1997).
20. V. W. Hughes, M. Grosse Perdekamp, D. Kawall, W. Liu, K. Jungmann and G. zu Putlitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 111804 (2001); M. Deile *et al.* [Muon g-2 Collaboration], hep-ex/0110044; R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1098 (2000).
 21. O. Bertolami, D. Colladay, V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, *Phys. Lett.* **B 395**, 178 (1997).
 22. R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1381 (2000); L.-S. Hou, W.-T. Ni, and Y.-C.M. Li, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 201101 (2003); B.R. Heckel, in Ref. [3], page 133.
 23. V. A. Kostelecký, R. Lehnert and M. J. Perry, *Phys. Rev.* **D 68**, 123511 (2003); O. Bertolami, R. Lehnert, R. Potting and A. Ribeiro, *Phys. Rev.* **D 69**, 083513 (2004).
 24. D. L. Anderson, M. Sher and I. Turan, *Phys. Rev.* **D 70**, 016001 (2004); E. O. Iltan, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 19**, 327 (2004).
 25. S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecký, C. D. Lane and T. Okamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 141601 (2001); Z. Guralnik, R. Jackiw, S. Y. Pi and A. P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Lett.* **B 517**, 450 (2001); A. Anisimov, T. Banks, M. Dine and M. Graesser, *Phys. Rev.* **D 65**, 085032 (2002); C. E. Carlson, C. D. Carone and R. F. Lebed, *Phys. Lett.* **B 549**, 337 (2002).
 26. See Ref. [2]; V. A. Kostelecký and R. Lehnert, *Phys. Rev.* **D 63**, 065008 (2001); M. S. Berger and V. A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev.* **D 65**, 091701 (2002).